1 2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

LAWTIS DONALD RHODEN,

v.

SHERIFF MICHAEL S. CORONA, et

Plaintiff,

Defendants.

12

13

14

15

al.,

16

17

18

24 25

26 27

28

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NO. CV 08-00420 JHN (SS)

ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636, the Court has reviewed the Second Amended Complaint ("SAC"), the parties' motions for summary judgment, all of the records and files herein, the Magistrate Judge's Reports and Recommendations, and Plaintiff's Objections to the Recommendations denying Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment and granting in part Defendants' motion for partial summary judgment ("Objections"). After having made a de novo determination of the portions of the Reports and Recommendations to which Objections were directed, the Court concurs with and adopts the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the Magistrate Judge.

Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED THAT:

- 1. Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment is DENIED.
- 2. Defendant Bergquist's Motion for Summary Judgment is DENIED.

- 3. Defendants' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment is DENIED as to Plaintiff's claims regarding the denial of roof recreation (SAC 16, 24), the denial of clothing and bedding exchange (SAC 8, 22), and the discarding of Inmate Message Slips (SAC 7-8).

- 4. Defendants' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment is GRANTED as to Plaintiff's claims regarding the withholding of legal mail (SAC 9-11), the discarding of legal documents (SAC 9, 11-13), the provision of insufficient food (SAC 13, 15), the requirement that Plaintiff kneel during cell searches (SAC 19), the transfer to a smaller, more restrictive cell (SAC 23-24), the delay and denial of access to the courts (SAC 9-11), the denial of procedural due process (SAC 14, 18-19, 23), and the endangerment of Plaintiff. (SAC 14-15, 17). Plaintiff's claims regarding these issues are therefore dismissed with prejudice.

- 5. Plaintiff's claim for declaratory relief is DENIED and DISMISSED.

- 6. JOHN DOE Defendants 1-10 of the Second Amended Complaint are DISMISSED.

1	7. Further proceedings shall be conducted to determine the claims
2	that were not adjudicated in Defendants' favor, as set forth in this
3	Order, and those claims that Defendants did not seek to resolve by
4	summary judgment. (See Report and Recommendation re Defendants' Motion
5	for Summary Judgment at 15, n. 9).
6	
7	8. The Clerk shall serve copies of this Order by United States
8	mail on Plaintiff and on counsel for Defendants.
9	
.0	DATED: November 1, 2010
1	$M_{\mathcal{O}}$
.2	JACQUELINE H. NGUYEN
.3	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
4	V
.5	
.6	
.7	
.8	